

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

Glenda A Smith, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Hamilton County Juvenile Court, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:18-cv-00462

Judge Michael R. Barrett

Plaintiffs—Smith and T.J., Smith’s daughter—bring eleven causes of action against various Defendants who were purportedly involved in one of Smith’s state court child custody case involving T.J. in the Hamilton County Juvenile Court (Doc. 40). The matter is currently before the Court on Defendants’—Hamilton County Juvenile Court, Hamilton County Job and Family Services, Hamilton County Child Support Enforcement Agency, Hamilton County Board of Commissioners, Moira Weir, Nya Cruse, and Holly Pelphrey—Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (Doc. 50) and the briefing thereto (Docs. 53, 59, 64).

In their supplemental memorandum, Defendants explain that Plaintiff Smith abandoned her claims for reunification with Plaintiff T.J. in the underlying Hamilton County Juvenile Court case (Doc. 64). Defendants attach a Judicial Entry from the Hamilton County Juvenile Court case involving Plaintiff T.J., signed by a Hamilton County Juvenile Court judge, which states that “[m]other is seeking no services leading to reunification at this time and testified she agrees that the child’s best interests are served by staying in

her current placement until high school graduation.”¹ (Doc. 64 at PageID 662). Defendants argue that Plaintiff Smith’s abandonment of her claims in the Hamilton County Juvenile Court case are dispositive of the claims in the Amended Complaint and this matter is moot. (*Id.*). The Court agrees. Moreover, Plaintiffs did not respond to Defendants’ supplemental memorandum and the time to do so has passed.²

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Defendants’ Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (Doc. 50) is **GRANTED**. The remaining motions pending before the Court (Docs. 30, 42, 55, 56, 65, 68, 73, 78, 82, 83) are **DENIED** as **MOOT** and the Clerk of the Court is directed to **TERMINATE** this matter from the active docket of this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

____s/ Michael R. Barrett_____
Michael R. Barrett, Judge
United States District Court

¹ See *Barany-Snyder v. Weiner*, 539 F.3d 327, 332 (6th Cir. 2008) (“matters of public record, orders, items appearing in the record of the case, and exhibits attached to the complaint” may be taken into account without converting a Rule 12(c) motion to a Rule 56 motion) (quoting *Amini v. Oberlin Coll.*, 259 F.3d 493, 502 (6th Cir. 2001)).

² Although Plaintiff Smith represents herself and daughter in this matter, she is a licensed attorney and the Court will not afford her the solicitude customarily granted to *pro se* litigants. Cf. *Boyd v. United States*, 932 F. Supp. 2d 830, 840 (S.D. Ohio 2013).